

REMARKS

The Response to Amendment mailed on Aug. 11, 2005 has been received and reviewed. The Examiner asserts that inclusion of claim 36 in Applicants' election of Species I was improper, apparently because claim 36 recites "a controller which is not recited in any of claims 1-32 or 64-67." (Communication, page 2).

However, Applicants note that a controller is not depicted in any of FIGS. 1, 2, 7A, 7B or 8. As such, it does not appear that the Examiner was differentiating between the identified species based on a controller.

Nevertheless, the Examiner now requires that an election be made between group 1, comprising claims 1-32, 64-67 and 68-90, and group 2, comprising claims 36-63 and 68-90.

An election is hereby made, without traverse, to prosecution the invention of group 1 comprising claims 1-32, 64-67 and 68-90.

It is noted that the Examiner has stated that claims 1 and 64 are generic and that claim 68 is generic to claims 1, 36 and 64. As asserted in the previously submitted response, Applicants maintain that other claims may be generic.

Applicants note that, upon the allowance of a generic claim, claims depending therefrom in a non-elected species would also be allowable. Applicant further submits that, based on the Examiner's classification of claim 68 being generic to claim 36, that upon allowance of claim 68, claim 36 should be considered by the Examiner for allowance as well.

Respectfully submitted,


Bradley B. Jensen
Registration No. 46,801
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: September 12, 2005

BBJ/sm

Document in ProLaw